

# 2026 Sector Webinar Transcript

Transcript



Version 1 | June 2026



Australian Government  
Australian Skills Quality Authority

ASQA

(Working together)

~ Slide: 2026 Sector Webinar – 28 May 2026 ~

**Mel Cox:**

Good afternoon everybody. It's really great to have you with us this afternoon. My name is Mel Cox and I'm the Director of the Policy and Education team here at ASQA. We have had a fantastic level of interest in today's webinar. There's several thousand people actually registered to join us today and we really appreciate you taking that time to join us this afternoon.

Just quickly, I'll say I'm presenting some of the slides today, but I'm also ably joined by a couple of my colleagues, Paige O'Riley and Liz Moran, who'll be walking you through some of the other sections as we go through this afternoon's webinar. Before we get underway and before I forget, just to address the very most common question we often get with these things, yes, these slides will be made available on our website in the coming weeks alongside our workshop slides. For those of you who went to the workshops, you might be waiting for those as well. So yes, both sets will be made available via our website.

~ Slide: Acknowledgement of Country ~

Okay, let's get started.

I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the many lands on which we're all dialling in from today. Liz and I are joining you from Brisbane, which is the lands of the Turrbal and Yuggera people. Paige is joining us from Melbourne on the land of the Wurundjeri people of the Kulin Nation. We'd all like to pay our respects to the people, cultures and elders past, present, and emerging and extend that respect to any Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people that we have joining us on the webinar today.

~ Slide: Webinar Overview ~

Okay, so this afternoon we've got a few topics to cover. We are going to talk a little bit about our revised regulatory approach and our insights into the 2025 Standards. If you were at one of our recent face-to-face workshops, thank you. They were great. We got a lot out of those and I hope you did too.

You will find that some of today's content is familiar, though we do have quite a hefty Q&A session built into this webinar this afternoon drawn from the themes of the questions you've all pre-lodged. And so definitely you might like to hang around to hear about those. We'll also be giving you some practical tips on maintaining compliance and helping you stay on track with your compliance and our principles for the responsible use of AI in the VET sector. Again, we had some really amazing feedback when we were testing the draft principles via the workshops in March and April and now we're getting very, very close to finalising them. So we'll show you the latest version of those. Throughout each section of today's presentation, we will have some Q&As and I know that you've got a function available to you to ask those.

Okay, next slide.

~ Slide: Ask Us... ~

So we have received over 120 pre-submitted questions. For those of you who did that when you registered, thank you. It helps us get an idea of the themes and that allows us to group the questions together. There is definitely still the opportunity to keep asking questions as we go throughout this session and we will try and address some live questions towards the end if we get time. Don't worry if we don't get to every single question, they become a repository for us along with the 750 odd questions that we got through the workshops. So please do use the live stream question function as we go today if you'd like to and fear not if we don't get to actually answering all those live today, we will publish our updated FAQs on our website over the coming few weeks.

~ Slide: Our Revised Regulatory Approach ~

Okay, let's get into it.

Our revised regulatory approach. Okay, so I'm going to talk through this one. The revised regulatory approach is coupled with and designed to complement our new cost recovery model, which is coming into effect on the 1 July.

So next slide please.

~ Slide: ASQA's Regulatory Assessment and Monitoring Approach is coming...~

Very soon, this document will be made available on our website. So it's our revised regulatory assessment and monitoring approach. I am talking today on an assumption that our Minister, Minister Giles, is going to be happy to sign the revised cost recovery instruments, so the fees instrument and charges instrument after he has sought the approval of the State and Territory Ministers, as he's obliged to do, and that'll all happen in the next couple of weeks and we'll be ready for launch on the 1 July. And this document is one of the key documents that you'll be able to access that will help you more deeply understand and give you that transparency around the elements of our assessment approach that are changing and why. For now, for this afternoon, I'm just going to touch at a high level on a couple of them.

Okay. Next slide, please.

~ Slide: Our revised assessment approach ~

This slide's familiar to any of you who came to not just the previous workshop series, but the one before that. It outlines in a broad sense our assessment approach. The blue boxes show what happens behind the scenes here at ASQA while the pink boxes show where we interact with you as a provider. I'm going to focus on the first three steps, trigger, plan and notify you. So every assessment and in fact, every activity we undertake, whether that's an audit, an application-based assessment, a tip off, whatever it might be, they are always triggered by something and that trigger is always based on risk. Where we have had a trigger and decided to do an assessment activity, we will then plan that activity. That means that we define the scope, which is the focus of our assessment and why this step is critical is that it ensures that we concentrate only on what is necessary, relevant, and significant based on the information we

have at hand. As we move through the planning and that scope is set, we will notify you about the activity and clearly outline what it's going to involve.

And that leads me into our next slide, please.

*~ Slide: Performance assessments ~*

For our new model and cost recovery purposes from the 1 July, we have decided to move away from the \$250 an hour hourly charge for our audits and performance assessments towards a fixed fee model. This was mainly born out of feedback from you and the sector and your peak bodies to say that having an hourly rate is a bit like how long is a piece of string? You could never really properly budget or forecast what a assessment might cost you in the end. So we've heard that and as part of the cost recovery review have decided to move to a fixed fee model for our performance assessments. And to do that, we need to shape the size and scope by categories so that we can set a fee for each category.

As you can see on the screen here, we will have 4 categories for performance assessments. They range from small micro assessments under category 1 up through the range to the highest category, which is 4, which is a quite large scale assessment. So what this means is that from the 1 July, if we write to you saying we're instigating a performance assessment, you will be advised of your category at the beginning of that activity based on the scoping that we have already done. So, in determining what category your assessment is going to be in, we have done that scoping of the risks I referred to a moment ago. And what that means in a practical sense is factors such as the number of risks and the nature of those risks that we want to examine, the training products that we want to sample, whether we want to visit any of your sites, and how many discussions or interviews we might want to do with say staff and students.

That helps us shape up and predict how many hours of effort are going to be required and cost recovery is based on hours of effort for the main part. So you'll know that upfront at the start of a performance assessment when it's been triggered and we've notified you. If during the performance assessment things emerge, additional risks come on the radar and we need to go further down a particular path and seek more evidence from you, we may need to increase the category upward, but we would always let you know that that is what's going to happen and the fee that comes with that.

When a performance assessment concludes and many will conclude around category 1 and category 2, you'll get a report from us, a Findings Report so that we can let you know what decisions we have made around your compliance.

Okay. Next slide please.

*~ Slide: Compliance Resolution ~*

In some cases as a result of something like a performance assessment or other monitoring activity, we find some non-compliance. In this space moving forward, again, from a cost recovery and charging point of view, we'll be using tiered pathways as part of our compliance resolution approach. There are 4 pathway tiers. If a provider has had non-compliance found and

we decide that needs to enter into a compliance resolution, then that process will start at tier one.

Okay? So regardless of which performance assessment category we've done, whether it's category 1, 2, 3, or 4, if non-compliance leads to us deciding to pop you into a compliance resolution pathway, and it won't always, sometimes some non-compliance is very minor and can be fixed before the performance assessment process closes out. But if we do move into a compliance resolution pathway, it will start at pathway 1. As we go back and forward with you and find that the non-compliance has not yet been fully rectified and that we're not yet fully satisfied that everything is back on track and a return to compliance has been achieved, then more effort and hours are required by us and that's when we move up the pathway tiers, pathway 2, pathway 3, pathway 4. I'm sure that being the great providers and the dedicated providers that you are on the call today, you're not going to reach pathway 4.

By pathway 4, we are at a point where we're probably starting to think about notices of intent to cancel and the like. We feel confident that just like now, most of our non-compliances are resolved early, efficiently, and satisfactorily in a sustainable way and can be closed out quite early in that process.

Okay, next slide please.

*~ Slide: 1 July changes and transition arrangements ~*

So what is happening from a transition point of view?

First of all, I just need to say again, this is all to be caveated around our Minister having not yet signed off the formal instruments, which will be signed off and go on the Federal Register of Legislation. And at that point this will be enshrined as our approach from 1 July, but let's assume that that does take place as we hope and intend. Then around the transition arrangements, this is what you will see. For applications, if you have submitted your application and paid for it, i.e. it is a valid application before the end of the 30 June before midnight, then it will stay under the current charging model. If you lodge it and it becomes a valid application from July 1 onwards, the new costing model and approach will apply.

The same applies to performance assessments. So if a performance assessment has already started, if you got a letter from us yesterday saying that we're about to do a performance assessment and it's starting this week, it won't have a category on it yet. We're not able to adopt this model until it's formally agreed and therefore that performance assessment will carry on as is familiar now under the \$250 an hour arrangements until it's resolved. If we go into compliance resolution, that again, it's that simple principle, if you like, of pre-July old model, current model, post 1 July new model. So the underpinning principle here really is as the white text on the screen here says, if an activity, an activity can be an application, an assessment, an audit, a compliance resolution, all of those mix of things, if it starts before the 1 July, it's under the current model. If it starts after the 1 July, it'll be under the new model. Okay?

So next slide please.

*~ Slide: Your questions answered – Revised Regulatory Approach*

We have had some good questions come in about our new model naturally. We might go to the next one please, Nicholas.

*~ Slide: Q&A - Question 1 ~*

So question 1, will ASQA be publishing information on its revised regulatory approach? So yes, as I've just said, definitely you will see a revised regulatory approach document like I showed you a couple of slides ago, but you'll also... Sorry, Nick, I should have said next slide for the sake of the answer.

*~ Slide: Q&A - Question 1 Answer ~*

We will also be publishing as is the norm, our revised Cost Recovery Implementation Statement, our CRIS. That will go up on our website contemporaneously with the publication on the Federal Register of the fees and charges determinations once the Minister has had State and Territory agreement and signed those off. So yes, in June there will be quite a bit of information that we will publish. So keep an eye on our website for when that comes out. We'll also, of course, use our usual channels and methods of notifying you that important materials like this have been released.

Next slide please.

*~ Slide: Q&A - Question 2 ~*

Okay. Second question, how will ASQA ensure transparency and fairness in our cost recovery model, particularly performance assessments? That's a really fair question.

Next slide, please, Nick, for the answer. Thank you.

*~ Slide: Q&A - Question 2 Answer ~*

As I said before, we're actually hoping that the move to the fixed fees is the big change here that allows that transparency to happen so that you have got the ability to consider what the regulatory costs might be for you of being an RTO in this scheme. And when you do get told that a performance assessment is happening for you this year at any point, you'll know upfront how much you're up for. We also do hope, in this context, that it's not just performance assessments that you feel you're getting more transparency on. As dry a material as it might be, the CRIS when we publish it, will contain quite a bit of explanatory information around why we're charging what we are for every type of activity that we undertake so that you can understand it more fully.

And of course, we will continue like we have with the Standards and every other reform to happily take questions and publish FAQs and provide our Service Delivery team with scripts and the like so that you can ask questions as they come up and you experience these activities in this new format for the first time. Okay.

Third question, next one please, Nick.

~ Slide: Q&A - Question 3 ~

Can providers review or question our cost recovery decisions and invoices?

~ Slide: Q&A - Question 3 Answer ~

Like with pretty much everything we do, yes, providers can always ask us and seek clarification. And the best way to do that is during the activity itself. You will be interacting with our people. Absolutely, seek clarification. Ask us how the fee has been determined, how we've reached the particular category through the scoping that we've done. And if you're not clear on what it is that we've scoped into your assessment, ask us and we're happy to relay that information.

Your invoices as well, as always, will reflect the charges that are in the determinations and on the register of legislation and in the CRIS. So there is full transparency there. We can't just charge any random amount. We are bound by those requirements and certainly you can ask us for information if and when you're not clear about what it is that the invoice covers or the potential charge is about.

Okay. Next slide, please, Nicholas.

~ Slide: 2025 Standards Insights ~

I am going to pause there. As I said earlier, if we get time for live questions at the end, I'm happy to take more on that topic, but in the meantime, I am going to hand over to Paige O'Riley and Paige is going to give you some insights into what we've been seeing 11 months into the revised Standards. Over to you, Paige.

~ Slide: What's going well ~

### **Paige O'Riley:**

Thank you, Mel. And hi everyone. It's good to see so many of you tuned in today. I'm going to take you all through what we've been seeing over the past 11 months with the implementation of the 2025 Standards. And I want to start by highlighting a few areas where we are seeing providers meeting the Standard. As you know, ASQA takes a risk-based approach. That means we scope each assessment to focus on the issues, risks, and training products that matter most, using things like your website, internal data, and information from other agencies. So in a lot of cases, if nothing is flagged during the scoping process, that's a good sign in itself.

At the moment, we're not seeing concerns against Standard 2.6 on student wellbeing, which is one of the new Standards in the 2025 Standards. We're also not seeing issues with Standard 2.3 on student support and providers are generally offering timely and appropriate support to students. There's also been strong adherence to Clause 7 around guarantees and inducements with information to students remaining clear and accurate. And finally, we're seeing providers meet Standard 3.2 and the Credential Policy with most trainers and assessors holding the required TAE qualification.

If you do think you are missing the mark in any of these areas, particularly the newer standards, it is worth going back to our previous webinar recordings and workshop materials. And there's

also broader guidance on our website including the Practice Guides, which can be really helpful.

*~ Slide: Top 4 areas of concern ~*

Let me now provide you with the insights we are seeing through our performance assessment work and the top four areas of concern. The most common issue we are seeing, and that's by quite a margin, is poor quality assessment systems and practises. This links to Outcome Standard 1.4, which requires assessment to be fair, appropriate, and capable of supporting accurate judgments of competency.

The next most frequent issue is poor quality training. This relates to Outcome Standard 1.1, which focuses on training being engaging, well-structured, and aligned with the skills and knowledge required by the training product.

We then see poor quality continuous improvement and this relates to Outcome Standard 4.4, which requires providers to systematically monitor and evaluate their delivery and use those insights to drive meaningful ongoing improvement.

And finally, we have unsuitable or unqualified trainers and assessors. This relates to Outcome Standard 3.3, which requires training and assessment to be delivered by people with the right current industry skills and knowledge. Now, this is not in relation to the Credential Policy component, which providers are doing well in. As I mentioned on the previous slide, it is around the industry competency skills and knowledge.

Let's take a deeper dive into each of these issues so hopefully you get some really good insights to take away with you today.

*~ Slide: Poor quality assessment systems or practices ~*

So as I just mentioned, one of the strongest ongoing themes is poor quality assessment systems and practises. We are seeing situations where there are unfair assessment systems and practises including situations where reasonable adjustments are not used properly or not used at all, even when there is clearly a need for reasonable adjustments to be used. Students are also not receiving meaningful feedback and that's leaving them to be unsure of what they need to improve on or why they received a particular outcome. In addition, many assessment approaches lack flexibility and too often they are not adapted to different student needs or ways of demonstrating competence. We're also seeing misalignment between assessment tasks and the actual skills and knowledge required by the training product. One recent example from an audit involved a provider clustering seven units of competency and they use a single broad knowledge question to assess one element from each unit. Whilst clustering is allowed, the question was so general and broad that it didn't allow the students to demonstrate the required depth for any of the seven units of competency.

There are also ongoing concerns about reliability. We continue to see inconsistent decision making between assessors and across locations, meaning two students with similar evidence can receive different outcomes. And finally, we're identifying significant gaps in academic integrity and authenticity checks. In a performance assessment recently, it focused on the first

aid unit of competency. An entire class submitted identical written responses, and this was right down to the same spelling mistake. Every student had the same spelling mistake and this spelling mistake also appeared in the assessor guide.

*~ Slide: Poor quality assessment systems or practices ~*

So I want to share a few practical tips to help strengthen the quality of your assessment, systems and practises. So first, context matters. Use tools tailored to your student cohort. Now, contextualising doesn't mean changing unit requirements, it means adjusting scenarios, language and examples so that they make sense for your students, as well as the industry and delivery mode. A one size fits all tool rarely works well. Second, keep it clean. Reasonable adjustments are essential for access and equity, but they must not weaken assessment integrity or remove required skills and knowledge. For example, using reasonable adjustment for a work in a team unit when only one student is enrolled isn't appropriate as working alone cannot replace teamwork. Next, see it to assess it. Where direct observation is required, you need to actually see the student demonstrating the skills, either in the workplace or in simulation. Evidence must be genuine, recent, and collected appropriately. Relying only on log books or supervisor notes isn't enough without clear observation.

Consistency is also critical. Students should be assessed in the same way regardless of the assessor. We often see issues where criteria are interpreted differently or judgement varies too much. And things such as moderation, validation, benchmark samples and regular training all help keep decisions consistent. And finally, to protect the process, academic integrity is essential. We're seeing risks like contract cheating, identity issues, misuse of AI, and unverified workplace evidence. So strong and consistent controls are important. Now at the bottom of the slide there are some reminders, but I just want to highlight one of these and this is around mandated license tools. These often do not cover all unit requirements as they are designed specifically for licensing outcomes. Now, while you can't change the mandated assessment tool, you can develop supplementary tools to ensure full coverage and make sure your validation processes keep those up to date.

*~ Slide: Poor quality training ~*

Next, let's look at the focus area of training and this is something we very commonly include in the scope of our performance assessments. First, we are seeing that training product requirements are not always being met. We're seeing programs that don't fully cover what the training product mandates or that compresses content in ways that strip out essential instruction, practice and feedback. Second, the training designed isn't always appropriate for the student cohort. In some cases, the mode of delivery is simply not suitable and in others the way training is delivered doesn't match what was described to students. We're also seeing training that fails to reflect current industry practice, and this leaves students with outdated skills and employers unsure about graduate readiness. And thirdly, the structure and pace of training are often not fit for purpose. We have identified programs where the volume of learning is not aligned with AQF expectations and most of the time this means course durations are too short and students are not getting the time to practice skills before they're assessed.

As an example, an RTO delivering Early Childhood Education and Care partnered with centres employing students full-time. Many of the students were new to the sector. Rather than structuring training with scheduled instruction, supervised practice and timely feedback, the provider would hand out self-learning materials, send them out to work in the centres and collect assessments at a later point in time.

This was before they would issue the next tranche of materials. The trainer didn't schedule workplace visits to observe progress or provide coaching to the students and any learning in this case was largely incidental, on the job exposure, which was not structured training aligned to the requirements of the training products. In this example, it could not be demonstrated that students had meaningful opportunities to practice and receive feedback before assessment or that guidance was provided to workplace supervisors on what role they were expected to play in developing those competencies.

*~ Slide: Poor quality training ~*

So, let's talk about what quality training design looks like and how you can make sure it sets your students up for success. First off, know your students. Everything starts with understanding who is in front of you; their backgrounds, their skills, their experience, their learning needs. All of these things matter. When training is designed as if every student is the same, that's when we see a red flag. As we know this leads to disengagement and poor outcomes for the student. Next, don't cut it short. AQF expectations around volume of learning are there for a reason. Training can only be shortened where there is clear documented evidence of existing skills or knowledge. And when training is compressed, students lose the chance to practice and consolidate their skills. Another key point is meeting the industry mark. Training must reflect what's happening now in industry and not what was happening 5 or 10 years ago. Many industries have licensing or regulatory requirements that influence training design and students need to be prepared not just for the qualification but for those licensing outcomes too.

Online delivery can be effective, but only when it is genuinely supporting quality outcomes. It may not be suitable for every unit or every student. And a useful test for you is to think whether students can actually develop the required skills and knowledge through that mode. And if not, it's obviously not the right approach for that unit or student. Continuous improvement is also essential and you should be improving every round. Each cohort gives you valuable information such as what worked, what didn't, where students struggled, even where trainers needed more support. So you should be using that feedback along with your data, trainer's insights and supervisor input to refine your content, your pacing, your activities, and your assessments.

A quick couple of reminders to close training. While a formal training and assessment strategy document is no longer required, your approach still needs to be clearly documented. The second, there is no single formula for course duration, but you need to be able to show sound professional judgement. And finally, be cautious with purchased resources. They often look polished, but that doesn't mean they automatically cover all unit requirements. They can be a useful starting point, but you're still responsible for ensuring they fully meet unit requirements

and are properly contextualised for your students. You should be treating these as a starting point and not a finished product.

*~ Slide: Poor quality continuous improvement ~*

So, the third area of concern is poor quality continuous improvement. What we're increasingly seeing is that while many organisations have continuous improvement processes on paper, those systems often aren't fit for purpose. There may be documents, templates, and registers, but in practice, they don't meaningfully monitor or evaluate training and assessment quality. The Standards require ongoing proactive review and adjustment. Too often, systems are reactive, superficial, or only activated when something goes wrong or when ASQA arrives. And this is instead of having a structured and continuous system in place. A common pattern is providers purchasing policies and procedures and then they file them away and never implement or contextualise them. A document in a folder is not a system.

We're also seeing inadequate oversight of third party arrangements and now it is important to remember that providers remain fully responsible for all delivery, even when there are third parties, and they must actively monitor performance, review data and feedback and intervene early when issues arise. But in many cases, we're finding little to no monitoring at all and this creates significant risk for students and for you as the responsible provider. Another common issue is the absence of visible recorded continuous improvement. Some providers are doing bits and pieces of review informally, but they're not documenting their findings, they're not analysing trends, and they're not showing how they use that information to make improvements. And it's important to remember that a continuous improvement register full of light bulb replacements and air conditioning repairs does not count as continuous improvement. Continuous improvement must show improvements in the quality of training and assessment. Finally, feedback, complaints and appeals are often underused. These are a valuable source of insight but are frequently collected without proper analysis or are limited to a single source, reducing their effectiveness.

*~ Slide: Poor quality continuous improvement ~*

So, to close out the continuous improvement focus area, I want to leave you with a few practical reminders. Now, the first is to know the rules. Make sure you understand your legislative and regulatory obligations and just importantly, how to apply them in your context. Next, make self-assurance a habit. As I said, monitoring shouldn't be something that happens once a year or only when ASQA is on the horizon. And remember to improve everywhere. Continuous improvement isn't just for the training and assessment, it applies across your whole organisation. Every area such as governance, student support, third party arrangements can all benefit from reflection and refinement. A helpful tip here is that generic templates can only take you so far. Tailor your processes so they genuinely fit your operations and the way you deliver training.

~ Slide: *Unsuitable or unqualified trainers and assessors* ~

Now we will move to the final area of concern, trainers and assessors. We're seeing individuals who are not suitably qualified or lack the competence or experience for the units they deliver. Some hold qualifications that don't align with the units or current industry expectations, while others have relevant past experience but no longer maintain industry currency. One recent example highlighted this clearly. There was a commercial cookery trainer that relied only on a WhatsApp screenshot showing they were helping out with providing soup at an event and food for a birthday party. This was provided alongside a 20-year-old qualification that was obtained overseas and together that was the only evidence of current skills, knowledge, and competency. This was clearly insufficient to demonstrate competence across an entire qualification and unfortunately, it's not an isolated case. We do see this quite regularly. As a result, providers are often stretching their qualified staff beyond capacity and sometimes allocating them to multiple classes at the same time and we even have providers scheduling trainers and assessors to be delivering simultaneously across different states at the same time.

We're also seeing weaknesses in how providers verify trainer and assessor competency. Evidence is often incomplete, outdated, or not properly checked. A resume or certificate alone is not enough. Providers must demonstrate a robust ongoing process to ensure staff meet all requirements. Another issue is limited professional development. Now, the VET sector evolves rapidly and without regular opportunities to stay current with industry and training changes, it becomes difficult to deliver high quality relevant training. And finally, supervision of those working under direction is often inadequate. While the Standards allow for this arrangement, supervision must be active, meaningful, and well documented. In several cases, it was either absent or insufficient to ensure quality, safety, and proper student support.

~ Slide: *Unsuitable or unqualified trainers and assessors* ~

To finish the areas of concern before we move on to artificial intelligence, here are some key takeaways for when you return to the office. So first off, trainers and assessors must know their boundaries. They should only deliver and assess where they have the right unit specific industry skills and knowledge. General experience isn't enough. Competence must clearly align with the training product. Any gaps must be addressed before delivery begins. Also, keep skills current. Past experience alone is not sufficient in fast evolving industries. Trainers and assessors need regular meaningful professional development, such as short courses, industry updates, or workplace exposure, and this all helps to ensure training remains relevant. You should be carrying out due diligence on industry experts. Now, they can provide value for your students, but they also must be appropriately vetted and always work alongside a qualified trainer or an assessor, not independently.

And just some reminders at the bottom of the slide here, remember that professional development applies to everyone involved in training and assessment. So employees, contractors and third-party staff. Finally, industry currency expectations vary. Fast-moving sectors like IT require more frequent engagement than more stable fields such as marriage celebrancy. Expectations should reflect the pace of change, so you should be staying

connected with industry to understand what's required. I will now hand over to Liz, who will be discussing AI in the VET sector.

*~ Slide: Artificial Intelligence (AI) – Understanding the responsible use of AI ~*

**Liz Moran:**

Thank you, Paige. That was great. I'm sure that there's some practical tips there that providers can take back to their organisations. So we're now going to shift our focus to artificial intelligence or AI. This is an area that's evolving rapidly across the sector and we know many of you are already engaging with in different ways. In this next section, we'll walk you through what AI is, how it's showing up in the VET context, and most importantly, what responsible use of AI looks like in practice.

So next slide, please.

*~ Slide: What is Artificial Intelligence (AI) ~*

So let's begin with an overview of what AI actually is. So AI is a field of computer science that creates systems capable of performing tasks that normally require human intelligence, such as understanding language, learning from data and reasoning and problem solving. Generative AI is a type of AI that can create new content based on patterns it has learned from large amounts of existing information. It's important that AI tools are not confused with automation tools. So automation tools follow predefined rules, so they do the same task the same way every time. For example, automatically marking multiple choice questions, that's automation. There is no interpretation, learning, or decision making beyond the rule that you've programmed. AI tools, on the other hand, can interpret, analyse, and generate information. They work with complex or ambiguous inputs, for example, giving feedback on student writing, generating lesson materials, or summarising student questions.

Next slide, please.

*~ Slide: Risks vs Opportunities ~*

So our research into this space has revealed that while there are risks to AI use, there are also opportunities and they are almost equal in number. So this is why we're taking a guardrails approach to AI in the first instance. So our risk posture reflects the balance between managing risks and embracing opportunities. So in short, we want providers to really think about the risks of AI but not be too scared to use it. So as this slide shows, key risks include concerns around data privacy, algorithmic bias, academic integrity, reduced human interaction, transparency issues, and an overreliance on technology that may weaken internal capability. At the same time, AI offers substantial opportunities to improve efficiency, enhance accessibility and personalised learning, support curriculum design, and strengthen student engagement and progression. So together these factors underline the importance of adopting AI responsibly so providers can maximise its benefits while managing emerging risks effectively.

Next slide, please.

~ Slide: *Examples of poor AI provider use or governance* ~

So while AI brings opportunities and risks for providers, we're seeing through our regulatory work that some of these risks are already materialising in practical ways. So to help this make this more tangible, this slide highlights a few examples of where provider use or governance of AI has fallen short. These examples are not about blaming providers. They're about illustrating the kind of issues that can occur when AI isn't implemented responsibly or without the right oversight. So for example, we've seen Annual Declaration on Compliance responses submitted with visible AI prompts or drafting notes still left in the text. We've seen providers who are unprepared for students using AI inappropriately, including for cheating and who haven't communicated expectations to students clearly. And we've also seen providers using AI to write up compliance responses that are generic, not contextualised to their operations and don't reflect authentic evidence of practice.

Next slide, please.

~ Slide: *What is Artificial Intelligence (AI)* ~

To support providers in navigating these challenges, we have developed a set of draft principles for the responsible use of AI. These principles outline the core expectations for safe, ethical, and effective AI use across the VET sector. It's important to note that these principles are guidance, not regulatory requirements at this stage. They're designed to help providers understand how existing obligations under the 2025 Standards apply in AI enabled environments. So they are not planned to become part of the Standards in the near future. Instead, the focus is on supporting providers to embed responsible AI use within their current governance, risk management and compliance frameworks, rather than introducing new standalone regulatory requirements.

~ Slide: *Principle 1* ~

So let's start with Principle 1. AI use is supported by strong governance that ensures it does not undermine the quality or integrity of VET. So Principle 1 is about ensuring that AI is used in ways that protect the quality and integrity of VET through strong organisational governance, transparent processes, and robust controls that ensure AI enabled practises remain compliant and reliable. If you participated in our recent sector workshops, you may have noticed that the order of the principles has changed, and this was previously Principle 3. So this adjustment is intentional. So feedback from those workshops highlighted the importance of positioning governance at the forefront as it underpins all other aspects of responsible AI use. So by placing governance first, the principles now clearly emphasise that strong oversight, clear decision making structures, and effective risk management are the foundation for ensuring AI is used in a way that supports quality, integrity, and compliance across all areas.

So this principle directly aligns with Standard 4.1. If AI is not supported by clear governance structures, controls, and accountability, it can introduce risks that undermine the quality and integrity of VET. This principle also relates to Clause 9 under the Compliance Requirements, which requires providers to only issue certification documentation to students who have

legitimately demonstrated competence. So any use of AI must support and not jeopardise the assurance that students have earned certification properly.

Next slide, please.

~ Slide: Principle 2 ~

Principle 2 is that human oversight and accountability is maintained in all AI supported activities, ensuring that decisions affecting students remain the responsibility of qualified trainers, assessors, and staff. So Principle 2 examines how AI must be used in ways that ensures qualified trainers, assessors, and staff retain full responsibility for decisions, applying active human oversight and professional judgement to any AI supported activity. So this principle aligns mostly with Quality Areas 1, 3, and 4. So Quality Area 1 requires assessment to meet the Principles of Assessment and Rules of Evidence. And this AI principle supports that intent by reinforcing that if AI is used in an assessment related activities, a qualified assessor must maintain oversight to these requirements and assessment integrity is upheld. So Quality Area 3 highlights the importance of staff capability and accountability, supporting the need for active human oversight of any AI assisted activities. And Quality Area 4 ensures that governance arrangements, risk controls, and oversight systems are in place so that humans retain clear authority over decisions, meaning AI does not replace professional or organisational accountability.

Next slide. Thank you.

~ Slide: Principle 3 ~

So Principle 3 is that AI systems and tools manage information securely and in accordance with existing privacy, data protection, and record keeping obligations. So this principle is about ensuring that AI is used lawfully and in accordance with privacy, security, and data handling obligations across all aspects of training, delivery and support. So this aligns with Quality Area 4, Governance, and Clause 20 of the Compliance Requirements, as strong governance is what ensures that providers have the systems, controls, and leadership oversight needed to comply with privacy, data security, and record keeping obligations. And Clause 20 reinforces this by requiring providers to comply with relevant laws, including ensuring personal information is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with privacy legislation.

~ Slide: Principle 4 ~

So Principle 4 is that AI use supports and enhances student equity, inclusivity, accessibility, and wellbeing. So Principle 4 is about ensuring that AI supports and enhances equitable, inclusive, and accessible learning experiences for all students, including those with diverse backgrounds, abilities, digital literacy needs and support needs. So when we look at the Standards, this principle aligns with Quality Area 2, which is VET Student Support. This is a part of the standards that focuses on understanding student needs and making sure students have the right conditions to participate and succeed. If AI unintentionally leaves some students behind, for example, through inaccessible tools, it goes against the purpose of effective student support.

~ Slide: Principle 5 ~

And Principle 5 is that AI use aligns with training product requirements, industry expectations, and the needs of the relevant student cohort. So lastly, Principle 5 is about ensuring that AI is used deliberately and with clear purpose, strengthening the quality, integrity, and industry relevance of VET delivery across training, assessment, and student support. So this principle aligns with Quality Area 1, Training and Assessment, ensuring AI is used in a purposeful way that supports these obligations by keeping AI assisted practises aligned with the intent and integrity of the training product and the expectations of industries. It also aligns with Quality Area 2 as using AI in a deliberate way ensures that any AI supported training or assessment approaches remain appropriate to the skills, competencies, and digital literacies of the student cohort.

I will now hand you back to Mel.

~ Slide: Your questions answered - AI ~

**Mel Cox:**

Excellent. Thank you so much, Liz. Those of you who might've been at our workshops or some of our other presentations might've noticed a couple of little tweaks to some of our words in those principles, but the essence of them has remained the same. So really pleased with the way that providers have responded to those principles. So thank you.

All right, we're going to move into some Q&A now. Thank you for your engagement so far in the Q&A chat. That's been really useful. I am first going to tackle some of the pre-lodged questions that came in on various topics. And because Liz is on a roll, we'll start with some AI related questions first up.

So next slide please, Nicholas.

~ Slide: Q&A - Question 1~

Okay. Liz, the first question that we had pre-lodged, well, a theme of questions, if you like, providers were keen to know what are RTO's responsibilities in terms of having AI governance frameworks. I'll hand that one to you.

~ Slide: Q&A - Question 1 Answer ~

**Liz Moran:**

Thanks for that question, Mel. So under the 2025 Standards, there is no requirement to have a separate standalone AI framework, but you are responsible for ensuring any use of AI is governed within your existing systems, policies, and controls in line with the 2025 Standards and broader legal obligations. So RTOs may choose to implement additional or standalone AI policies to support governance where appropriate, but the key expectation is that AI is managed as part of your overall governance. So using the draft principles that we've just mentioned, there are a few key things that this means in practice.

So first, AI must be used lawfully and securely. That includes protecting student data and meeting your obligations under Clause 20 around compliance with laws. Second, human oversight is critical. AI can support your work, but it cannot replace professional judgement. Trainers and assessors remain fully responsible for assessment decisions. Third, you must protect the integrity of training and assessment. That means ensuring students genuinely demonstrate competence consistent with requirements, like Clause 9 of certification. Fourth, if AI is used, it should support not disadvantaged students. So AI needs to be accessible, appropriate, and aligned to your cohort. And finally, AI must be used deliberately and in line with training product requirements and industry expectations, not in a generic and an uncontextualized way. And across all of this, the key message is governance. So if you're using AI, it should be embedded into your risk management policies and continuous improvement processes, not sitting outside of them.

*~ Slide: Q&A - Question 2 ~*

**Mel Cox:**

Excellent. Good. Thank you, Liz. Question 2. What capability do our trainers and assessors need to manage AI in the classroom?

*~ Slide: Q&A - Question 2 Answer ~*

**Liz Moran:**

That's a great question. Trainers and assessors, they don't need to be AI experts, but they do need to be capable and confident users. So that starts with understanding what AI can and can't do, including when outputs may be unreliable or inappropriate. So a key responsibility is maintaining the integrity of training and assessment. This means being able to identify when student evidence may not be their own, ensuring decisions remain valid and reliable. A professional judgement is critical, so any AI generated content must be reviewed and validated and AI must never replace assessment decisions. Trainers and assessors remain accountable always. It also means designing assessments that ensure students genuinely demonstrate competence, even when AI is available and ensuring the Principles of Assessment and Rules of Evidence are met.

AI also must be used safely and ethically, including protecting student data and complying with organisational policies and legal obligations. So importantly, trainers play a key role in guiding student use of AI, or students using AI responsibly, and setting those clear expectations and boundaries. And as this space continues to evolve, ongoing capability development remains essential. So overall, it's not about being an expert, it's about being a capable, informed user who can apply professional judgement and maintain quality and integrity in an AI enabled environment.

~ Slide: Q&A - Question 3 ~

**Mel Cox:**

Great. Thanks, Liz. Third question, does ASQA have internal AI policies and what are the potential impacts on RTOs of us using AI?

~ Slide: Q&A - Question 3 Answer ~

**Liz Moran:**

It's a very great question. As we've been developing our regulatory approach, we've been really conscious that how we use AI shapes expectations for providers. So our own enterprise use and how we regulate it has been a key consideration in developing the principles, including building that internal capability. So ASQA has published an AI transparency statement on our website, which sets out our commitment to using AI in a way that lifts the quality and effectiveness of our services while maintaining strong standards around ethics, safety, and public trust. So at the moment, we're taking a very cautious and controlled approach to AI adoption. We're not using AI in public facing regulatory functions or decision making. All decisions and regulatory actions are made by humans. We see it as important; it's our way to walk the walk in this space. Our focus right now is internal productivity, considering where AI tools can help us improve efficiency and support better use of data and insights, but our approach to AI continues to be controlled, transparent, and human-led.

~ Slide: Your questions answered - General ~

**Mel Cox:**

Right you are. Okay. Good job, Liz. Thank you so much. So that's some of the popular pre-lodged AI questions. I can see in the chat that there's some other AI ones popping through. If we get time at the end, I might call you back on to have a look at some of those, but in the meantime we'll plough on.

Okay. I might move forward one more slide please, Nicholas.

~ Slide: Q&A - Question 1 ~

So these questions are more about the material you covered, Paige, and again, were pre-lodged. So here we go. This is the first one for you. When can we expect to be audited? Is it only upon renewal? This was one of the main themes of questions throughout all of our workshops as well. It came up time and again. So you'll be well versed in this answer, Paige.

~ Slide: Q&A - Question 1 Answer ~

**Paige O'Riley:**

Yes, it was a very popular question. So audits or performance assessments, as some of you know it, are not just limited to renewal periods. While a comprehensive scheduled audit may occur when your registration is due for renewal, we can actually audit at any time during the

registration cycle. Now, these audits are frequently risk-based and may be triggered by things such as complaints, unusual data patterns, previous audit findings, significant organisational changes, or a rapid growth in student numbers. It's also important to know that they can be either unannounced or announced. And someone did actually ask in the questions if they were going to be told if there's an unannounced visit. No, they won't. As the name suggests, it is unannounced for a reason.

In practice, this does mean that you should operate on the assumption that you are audit-ready at all times. Beyond full audits, we may also conduct targeted reviews or request evidence and checks such as samples of student records or assessment practises. So maintaining up-to-date documentation, running internal checks and ensuring staff understand compliance expectations will help you stay prepared regardless of when the audit occurs.

*~ Slide: Q&A - Question 2 ~*

**Mel Cox:**

Lovely. Thank you. Okay. I'm going to stick with you, Paige. I know you talked a little bit about this in your slides, but if you wouldn't mind just reiterating for us, how is ASQA monitoring third party providers?

*~ Slide: Q&A - Question 2 Answer ~*

**Paige O'Riley:**

Yeah, this is interesting because it's also a question that we get a lot. We got asked this quite a bit throughout the workshop series. And so just to be clear, ASQA does not regulate third parties directly. We regulate the RTO, which remains fully accountable for anything delivered on its behalf. So for a provider, it's important that you are overseeing what is happening with the third party. Monitoring is based on clear requirements and a risk-based approach. RTOs must also report all third-party arrangements, as this gives ASQA the visibility that you have a third-party arrangement. Multiple, when I say multiple, thousands of third parties is a risk. We have seen that in the past where providers have thousands. I think over 2,000 was one provider, which is quite risky. If you have a couple of third parties though, that's not necessarily a risk.

Again, it's important to remember that you are responsible for ensuring the training, assessment, and marketing meets the Standards. ASQA then tests all of the information that we have been given. So when you do notify us about third party arrangements through risk-based assessments, we focus on higher risk providers or delivery models using data intel and sector trends. And then if there are risks identified with a provider using third parties, we can investigate and take action with the provider, not with the third party.

In practice, this means ASQA is not overseeing each third party individually. Instead, it holds the RTO accountable and tests whether arrangements are working effectively. Under the 2025 Standards, there is a strong expectation that RTOs actively oversee their third party arrangements. Weak oversight, poor visibility or relying on third parties to make compliance decisions will be seen as higher risk and are more likely to attract regulatory attention.

### **Mel Cox:**

Thank you, Paige. You're absolutely right. Third parties have certainly been an unwelcome feature, one might say, in a lot of our qualification cancellations. And so please, if you're going to use third parties, and in many cases, they are incredibly valuable and worthwhile having and highly compliant but do that due diligence and keep that oversight.

*~ Slide: Q&A - Question 3 ~*

Okay. This is an interesting one. I don't actually recall this question coming up much during our workshop series, but it in various formats seem to surface a fair bit in our pre-logged questions for this webinar. So Paige, with the removal of the validation cycle under the Standards, how does ASQA define a sufficient approach to validation?

*~ Slide: Q&A - Question 3 Answer ~*

### **Paige O'Riley:**

Yeah, you're right. This question did come up quite a bit in the registration process. It's important to know that validation is not a one-off activity. It involves reviewing assessment practises and decisions after they've been applied to confirm that they are delivering consistent and appropriate outcomes. Importantly, while the old rigid cycle of having to meet 50% in the first 3 years has been removed, there is still an expectation that all training products are validated over time, and this is typically at least once every 5 years. However, it is more frequent where risks do emerge or when changes occur. The key shift is that you determine what to validate and how often based on your risks and context. What matters is that your approach is targeted and responsive, not just comprehensive for its own sake.

From a regulatory perspective, sufficiency is demonstrated through outcomes. That means showing that assessment is aligned, consistent, and improving over time. So in short, there's no single formula for validation, but a sufficient validation approach is one that is risk-based, embedded in your normal processes, and effective in maintaining assessment quality. If your validation gives you confidence in your outcomes and you act on what you find, then your approach is likely to be sufficient.

*~ Slide: Q&A - Question 4 ~*

### **Mel Cox:**

Lovely. Okay. Next one. I found this question quite an interesting one and we talked about this one a little bit over the last couple of days, actually. So when should a compliance risk be reported as a material change versus being reported as non-compliance in the Annual Declaration on Compliance?

And before I hand it to you, Paige, I'm going to give a high level simple response that says, sometimes it might be both ways. But over to you, Paige.

~ Slide: Q&A - Question 4 Answer ~

**Paige O'Riley:**

Thank you. I think you're right. We did talk about this a couple of times over the past couple of days. It's not really a question we've heard before, but I think it's probably stemmed from the release of the Statement of Regulatory Expectations that we released earlier this month, I think. Time's flying. It really does go to the distinction between reporting something as a material change versus the ADC, so the Annual Declaration on Compliance. And I think it comes down to the impact and timing.

A material change needs to be reported when something happens that significantly affects or is likely to affect your ability to comply with your obligations. So it is expected to be reported as close as possible to when it occurs or is identified. That is not limited just to structural or organisational changes. It can also include emerging compliance risks that could impact your ability to meet the Standards. On the other hand, the Annual Declaration is retrospective and so it's where your CEO confirms whether your organisation has complied over the past 12 months and discloses any non-compliance along with what has been done to address that issue. In practical terms, when you are thinking about a compliance risk, the key question is whether it affects your ability to comply right now. If the answer is yes or even potentially yes, then you should be considering a material change notification. Under the 2025 Standards, there is a strong expectation that you do not wait for certainty and that you do take a proactive approach to disclosure. And early transparency is seen as a strong indicator for good governance. And as I mentioned about the Statement of Regulatory Expectations, there is some more information in there around open, honest and transparent behaviour. If on the other hand, the issue is something you have identified through your own monitoring, you are managing it and it does not actually compromise your overall ability to comply, then it would generally be disclosed through your Annual Declaration.

The declaration is about being transparent about issues, not claiming that everything is perfect. We often find that in the ADC providers are just ticking and flicking to say that they are compliant when if they were actually declaring non-compliances that is seen better within ASQA. Where students are impacted, this is where professional judgement really is important. If the issue is isolated or contained and you can show that you have identified it, responded to it, and that your broader systems are still working effectively, then it would be typically be reported as non-compliance in the Annual Declaration, but if their impact points to something broader or systemic such as widespread issues with the training or assessment quality, then it is likely to be a material change because it signals a risk to your overall compliance capability as well as the quality of outcomes you are delivering.

So a simple way to think about it is that the material changes about what's happening now and whether it affects your ability to comply while the Annual Declaration is about reflecting on the past 12 months and being transparent about what you have identified and how you have responded. But as Mel has mentioned, it may be that you're declaring it in both the material change and the Annual Declaration.

### **Mel Cox:**

Yes, exactly. And I guess in terms of you mentioned before, Paige, the Statement of Regulatory Expectations that we put out a couple of weeks ago, if you haven't seen it, it is on the website and it might help give even a little bit more depth to what Paige has just shared. And yes, it is a fairly new thing. We haven't for quite some time used that type of voice, i.e., a Statement of Regulatory Expectations, and so it was a bit of an interesting test if you like, to see if that method of explanation around a particular thing we want to alert, particularly alert providers to as it bubbles to the surface is a risk. We've had quite good feedback about that format of alerting you all where we are starting to see something like that bubble up. So that's been good as well.

*~ Slide: Q&A - Question 5 ~*

Okay. Question 5, more for you, two I think more for you of the pre-lodge questions, Paige. So this one did come up during the workshops. It actually does keep coming up overall. It tends to be something we have to keep reiterating with providers and is really critically important. So how should RTOs manage privacy and confidentiality during practical assessments such as in disability training? This also applies in Early Childhood Education and Care, and aged care. And when we're talking here in this question about managing privacy and confidentiality, we're not just talking about the student. We're talking about the others who might be in the physical space while the practical assessment is taking place, such as a person with disability.

So Paige, could you give us a response to that one please?

*~ Slide: Q&A - Question 5 Answer ~*

### **Paige O'Riley:**

Sure. Yes, we did see this throughout our workshop series as well. So it's important that providers prioritise the privacy and dignity of individuals involved in practical assessments, particularly where sensitive personal or health information is involved. So this includes obtaining informed consent and clearly explaining how information will be used, recorded, and stored. Assessments should comply with privacy legislation and organisational policies by limiting access to personal information, de-identifying records where possible, and securely storing documentation. Practical assessments should minimise intrusion while still meeting requirements. Assessors must maintain professional boundaries and ensure discussions and feedback occur in private, respectful settings. And it's also important to remember that where real clients are involved, their wellbeing must be protected. If privacy risks cannot be managed, alternative methods such as simulations or case studies should be used to maintain both ethical practice and assessment integrity.

~ Slide: Q&A - Question 6 ~

**Mel Cox:**

Excellent. Thank you. Okay, question 6 for you, Paige. How can an RTO demonstrate through its documentation evidence that it is meeting the Outcome Standards, particularly in showing that students are achieving those high quality outcomes we're all so keen to see?

~ Slide: Q&A - Question 6 Answer ~

**Paige O'Riley:**

This is a really important question and the key point here is that evidence shouldn't be something you create when an assessment is scheduled or when a regulator turns up, as I mentioned in the Standards Insights earlier. It should come from the way your organisation is already operating day-to-day. Under the Outcome Standards, it's less about having documents and more about being able to show that your systems are actually working in practice to deliver quality outcomes. So what we're really looking for is what tools, methods, and checks you are already using to monitor and evaluate performance. For example, how are you checking that assessment decisions are consistent and valid? How are you monitoring student progress, completions, and feedback? How are you capturing and acting on trainer, student and industry input? And how are you identifying risks or issues early and responding to them? The evidence then flows naturally from these activities.

It might include student work, assessment decisions, validation outcomes, feedback data, or records of improvement, but these aren't created for compliance, they are just byproducts of your normal processes. Importantly, what we're looking for is a clear line of sight from what you do to what outcomes students are achieving. That means you can demonstrate not just that training and assessment occurred, but that students are developing and applying the skills and knowledge required and that those outcomes are consistent and aligned with industry expectations. So overall, it's less about what documents you have and more about how you know your training and assessment is working and how you can show that. If your systems are embedded, active and producing reliable information, then the evidence will already be there.

**Mel Cox:**

That's right. I will also add here, we were fortunate enough to participate in a conversation or a presentation last week by John King, who heads up NCVET and he was sharing with us and our peak bodies who were in the meeting with us that they are launching into a piece of work that looks into this very thing. So it's at the early stages, but it sounds fantastic insofar as they're not only going to measure outcomes in the traditional sense, completions and where they ended up in a job and all of those obvious things, but also success outcomes even for non-completions and what does that look like? So even where there's non-completion, there can still be a successful outcome for a particular individual depending on their starting point. And so he was really starting to share with us some of the thinking that they're doing in that space and we're all enthusiastic to help inform that along the way.

The other source of really good feedback and data on outcomes is the QI data, the learner and student surveys. And any of you who have heard me talk about this topic before will know that I've been as keen as anybody to see those 19 year-old surveys brought up to the modern era, and I'm really pleased to say that we actually have started. We're at the very, very beginning of it, but we're just about to start some work with our friends at DEWR, at the department, who own this piece to look at revising those surveys, us and our fellow VET regulators so that they can be updated. We of course have those issued on a calendar year. So the clock is ticking for us to try and get some good updates done to those and in readiness for next calendar year and that will give us all a lot better data on student outcomes as well and feedback. So lots of sources, not just your own, I guess is what I would say to that one.

Okey-dokey. Next slide please, Nicholas.

*~ Slide: Live Questions ~*

*~ Screen – Presenters ~*

I'm going to be daring and see if I can tackle a few of the questions that have come through the chat as we've been going. So in no particular order, and of course, as I said before, we're not going to get to all of them. I'm going to do this one first because it's actually not so much a question, but I thank the person for this great piece of feedback to us. It says, "I note that ASQA has identified the lack of assessment feedback to students as an issue. I agree. This is very important. However, why is it that both the Standards and ASQA's Practice Guides don't mention assessment feedback? How is this an issue but not important enough to be contained in the Standards themselves or ASQA guidance?"

Thank you. Great point. I absolutely will have us take that on board. It's my team actually that produces the Practice Guides. We're not going to revise the Standards anytime soon, but the Practice Guides we definitely can. We are in the throes of starting to draft version 2 Practice Guides for the anniversary of the Standards. We hope to publish those in July, and in doing so, we will skim these themes of where we're seeing the sorts of issues Paige outlined earlier today and make sure that more self-assurance questions and more information, more prompts are put in those version two Practice Guides, including that one. So thank you very much. Very pleased to take that sort of feedback.

The next one is an AI one. Liz, I'll just tackle this one. It's fairly quick and simple. It says, "Is using Turnitin..." For those of you who don't know, Turnitin is an AI-enabled tool that stands for plagiarism. "So is using Turnitin or something similar for plagiarism and cheating, mandatory or recommended?" Definitely not mandatory, not necessarily recommended either. What I would say about Turnitin is that as we understand it, you have settings in a tool like that where you get to decide as the RTO, the percentage of plagiarism that you want the Turnitin system to allow. So you can say, "I'm happy, I'm comfortable with 30% plagiarism. Only flag for me where you detect more than 30% plagiarism in a student's written assessment." Please don't ask us that question, would be my advice, as the regulator we're not going to endorse any percentage of plagiarism.

So please keep in mind that it can be a useful tool certainly for detection, but how you respond is something to really think through. Of course, we are somewhat protected, if you like, buffered in VET because we also have practical assessment as an underpinning principle. So we're not only relying on written assessment like Higher Ed can be where they do tend to use tools like Turnitin more often. So consider it, proceed with caution and we're never going to say that a setting a certain percentage of plagiarism is okay because we wouldn't think that that's right.

I've got one here that is about the transition arrangements for the cost recovery. If an application is received, I assume that means received by ASQA, before the 1 July, but ASQA has not yet notified the RTO whether a performance assessment will be conducted, would the application still sit under the current charging model or the new one? This is a really good example, case in point. Happy to unpack it. First thing I'd say is an application in the new world, an application isn't always going to be the primary trigger of a performance assessment. So while I appreciate that's probably been your common experience, oftentimes we have used the trigger of a renewal application, for example, to sift and sort into which ones we would then do a performance assessment for. We're sort of wanting to break that linkage. We might still do that, but we want to do performance assessments not always as a result of an application. So that would be the first thing I'd say.

But in this scenario, say you have submitted an application on the 15 June and you've paid the application fee, that's great. It's a valid application so it falls under the current charging framework. If on the 15 July, we've done a bit of scoping and a bit of looking at what has been submitted with the application as well as the information data and intelligence we have through other sources and have concluded that, say, a category 2 performance assessment is warranted. Those two things are decoupled because one was an application and this is now an assessment. They've spanned the 1 July and therefore the performance assessment, which has been triggered in July will fall under a category and the new charging framework. So hopefully that helps explain the difference. Each activity is a defined thing. You will see that when you see the CRIS document published. If you have a look through the tables, you'll be able to see how every activity is broken down into quite a granular level.

Okay. Let me have a look. Okay. Are the AI principles available on ASQA's website now? No, they're not yet. We have still, as I said before, and as Liz was saying, we have still been tweaking the words a little bit. So for example, Principle number 1... When we did the workshops, Principle number 1 was Principle number 3 and we had some feedback that governance; above all. Governance above all is the biggest thing to think about when you're starting out in AI. So we put the governance principle at number 1, instead of number 3. We also worded it a little bit differently. We had some interesting feedback. A few people picked up that in the draft version it was negatively worded as in AI does not compromise VET integrity and we've now switched it to say strong governance upholds. So a few word changes, but other than that, we think we're now good to go.

We have consulted through the workshops with over 1,800 people as well as through all the peaks a few times and our own advisory council. We've also met with the Jobs and Skills Councils, including Future Skills Organisation, which has a big role to play in this space, and various other agencies because obviously we're not Robinson Crusoe in terms of grappling with

AI. And so we think that that's consultation enough and it's better to now get on with getting something out there. So that's a long-winded way of me saying, yes, they will be published. I am going to put myself on a hook here because it's my team responsible for it. I would hope before the end of the financial year we'll have them up.

All right, plenty more questions we could answer. As I said before, rest assured they are all in the repository and we'll be able to draw them together and publish FAQs and answer your questions in the next few weeks.

*~ Slide: In case you missed it ~*

This slide here that is in front of you In Case You Missed It, I've already mentioned the Statement of Regulatory Expectations. The response to antisemitism, you saw that in the ADC questions. Just to let you know, yes, we are still very actively involved in the Antisemitism Education Task Force, that is ASQA, our CEO, is part of that task force under the Royal Commission banner. So please do keep thinking about whether your trainers and assessors would be able to notice antisemitism if emerged in a setting, a VET setting and how they would respond. The ESOS suspension on initial registrations and add to scope is also now enforced for the next 12 months. The QR code on this slide takes you to our website and a list of additional resources where you can navigate to those particular latest news articles and news items. Go to the next slide quickly, please, Nicholas. I've got one minute.

*~ Slide: Your feedback matters ~*

This is a different QR code if you so fancy... And I appreciate you've already given us 90 minutes of your time. If you so fancy spending the next 30 seconds scanning that QR code to give us feedback on today's webinar, was it useful or not. We have taken on board previous webinar feedback, so our November webinar said, "Please answer some live questions." So we've tried to do that today and keep improving as we all should. So yeah, we'd really appreciate your feedback.

While you do that, I will also just quickly wrap up and just leave that QR code there for you to scan. Our sincerest thanks for joining us this afternoon and for your questions as well. They are very useful and informative. As I said, you will see version 2 Practice Guides and the likes start to reflect some of this really rich intelligence that you've given us through both our workshops and today's webinar. It's a record, this webinar, how big it is. So we're taking that as a signal that you're enjoying interacting with us as the Regulator. And so I thank you very much and I will bid you good afternoon.

*~ Slide: Thank You ~*

Thanks, everybody. Bye for now.